arXiv:1108.3381v1 [math.RA] 17 Aug 2011

A GENERALIZATION OF SUPPLEMENTED MODULES

Yongduo Wang

Department of Applied Mathematics, Lanzhou University of Technology
Lanzhou 730050, P. R. China
E-mail: ydwang@lut.cn

Abstract Let M be a left module over a ring R and I an ideal of R. M is called an I-supplemented module (finitely I-supplemented module) if for every submodule (finitely generated submodule) X of M, there is a submodule Y of M such that $X+Y=M$, $X\cap Y\subseteq IY$ and $X\cap Y$ is PSD in Y. This definition generalizes supplemented modules and δ-supplemented modules. We characterize I-semiregular, I-semiperfect and I-perfect rings which are defined by Yousif and Zhou [15] using I-supplemented modules. Some well known results are obtained as corollaries.

Keywords: Semiregular, Semiperfect, Supplemented module, Small submodule

1. **Introduction and Preliminaries**

It is well known that supplemented modules play an important role in characterizing semiperfect, semiregular and perfect rings. Recently, some authors had worked with various extensions of these rings (see for examples [2, 8, 10, 15, 16]). As generalizations of semiregular rings, semiperfect rings and perfect rings, the notions of I-semiregular rings, I-semiperfect rings and I-perfect rings were introduced by Yousif and Zhou [15]. Our purposes of this paper is to chracterize I-semiregular rings, I-semiperfect rings and I-perfect rings by defining I-supplemented modules.

Let R be a ring and I an ideal of R, M a module and $S\leq M$. S is called *small* in M (notation $S\ll M$) if $M\neq S+T$ for any proper submodule T of M. As a proper generalization of small submodules, the concept of δ-small submodules was introduced by Zhou[16]. N is said to be δ-*small* in M if, whenever $N+X=M$, M/X singular, we have $X=M$. $\delta(M)=Rej_M(\wp)=\cap\{N\leq M \mid M/N\in\wp\}$, where $\wp$ be the class of all singular simple modules. Let $N, L \leq M$. N is called a *supplement* of L in M if $N + L = M$ and N is minimal with respect to this property. Equivalently, $M = N + L$ and $N \cap L \ll N$. A module M is called *supplemented* if every submodule of M has a supplement in M. A module M is said to be *lifting* if for any submodule N of M, there exists a direct summand K of M such that $K \leq N$ and $N/K \ll M/K$, equivalently, for every submodule N of M, M has a decomposition with $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$, $M_1 \leq N$ and $M_2 \cap N$ is small in M_2. N is called a *δ-supplement* [5] of L if $M = N + L$ and $N \cap L \ll_\delta N$. M is called a *δ-supplemented module* if every submodule of M has a δ-supplement. A module M is said to be *δ-lifting* [5] if for any submodule N of M, there exists a direct summand K of M such that $K \leq N$ and $N/K \ll_\delta M/K$, equivalently, for every submodule N of M, M has a decomposition with $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$, $M_1 \leq N$ and $M_2 \cap N$ is δ-small in M_2. An element m of M is called *I-semiregular* [2] if there exists a decomposition $M = P \oplus Q$ where P is projective, $P \subseteq Rm$ and $Rm \cap Q \subseteq IM$. M is called *an I-semiregular module* if every element of M is I-semiregular. R is called *I-semiregular* if ${}_RR$ is an I-semiregular module. Note that I-semiregular rings are left-right symmetric and R is ($\delta-$) semiregular if and only R is ($\delta({}_RR)-$) $J(R)$-semiregular. M is called *an I-semiperfect module* [10] if for every submodule K of M, there is a decomposition $M = A \oplus B$ such that A is projective, $A \subseteq K$ and $K \cap B \subseteq IM$. R is called *I-semiperfect* if ${}_RR$ is an I-semiperfect module. Note that R is ($\delta-$) semiperfect if and only R is ($\delta({}_RR)-$) $J(R)$-semiperfect. R is called *a left I-perfect ring* [15] if, for any submodule X of a projective module P, X has a decomposition $X = A \oplus B$ where A is a direct summand of P and $B \subseteq IP$. By [10, Proposition 2.1], R is a left I-perfect ring if and only if every projective module is an I-semiperfect module. For other standard definitions we refer to [3, 4, 14].

In this note all rings are associative with identity and all modules are unital left modules unless specified otherwise. Let R be a ring and M a module. We use

$Rad(M)$, $Soc(M)$, $Z(M)$ to indicate the Jacobson radical, the socle, the singular submodule of M respectively. $J(R)$ is the radical of R and I is an ideal of R.

2. PSD submodules and I-supplemented modules

In this section, we give some properties of PSD submodules and use PSD submodules to define (finitely) I-supplemented modules and I-lifting modules which are generalizations of some well-known supplemented modules and lifting modules. Some properties of I-supplemented modules are discussed. We begin this section with the following definitions.

Definition 2.1. ([12]) Let I be an ideal of R and $N \leq M$. N is PSD in M if there exists a projective summand S of M such that $S \leq N$ and $M = S \oplus X$ whenever $N + X = M$ for any submodule $X \leq M$. M is PSD for I if any submodule of IM is PSD in M. R is a left PSD ring for I if any finitely generated free left R-module is PSD for I.

Lemma 2.2. *Let M and N be modules.*

1. *If K is PSD in M and $f : M \to N$ is an epimorphism, then $f(K)$ is PSD in N.*
2. *If $L \leq N \leq M$ and L is PSD in N, then L is PSD in M.*
3. *If $L \leq N \leq M$ and N is PSD in M, then L is PSD in M.*
4. *Let $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$. If N_1 is PSD in M_1 and N_2 is PSD in M_2, then $N_1 \oplus N_2$ is PSD in M.*
5. *Let N be a direct summand of M and $A \leq N$. Then A is PSD in M if and only if A is PSD in N.*

Proof. (1) Let $f(K) + L = N, L \leq N$. Then $K + f^{-1}(L) = M$. Since K is PSD in M, there is a projective summand H of M with $H \leq K$ such that $H \oplus f^{-1}(L) = M$. So $f(H) \oplus L = N, f(H) \subseteq f(K)$. It is easy to see that $f(H) \cong H$ is projective.

(2) Let $M = L + X$, $X \leq M$. Then $N = L + (N \cap X)$. Since L is PSD in N, there is a projective summand H of N with $H \leq L$ such that $N = H \oplus (N \cap X)$, and hence $L = H \oplus (L \cap X)$. So $M = H \oplus X$.

(3) Let $M = L + K, K \leq M$, then $M = N + K$. Since N is PSD in M, there is a projective summand H of M with $H \leq N$ such that $M = H \oplus K$, and hence $M/K \cong H$ is projective. Thus the natural epimorphism $f : L \to M/K$ splits and $Kerf = L \cap K$ is a direct summand of L. Write $L = (L \cap K) \oplus Q, Q \leq L$, we have $M = Q \oplus K$. The rest is obvious.

(4) and (5) See [12].

□

Proposition 2.3. *Let M be a module and $N \leq M$.*

1. *$N \ll M$ if and only if $N \subseteq Rad(M)$, N is PSD in M.*
2. *$N \ll_\delta M$ if and only if $N \subseteq \delta(M)$, N is PSD in M.*

Proof. (1) “ $\Rightarrow$ ” is clear.

“ $\Leftarrow$ ” Let $M = N + L, L \leq M$. Since N is PSD in M, there is a projective summand H of M with $H \subseteq N \subseteq Rad(M)$ such that $M = H \oplus L$. So $Rad(H) \oplus Rad(L) = Rad(M) = H \oplus Rad(L)$. Thus $Rad(H) = H$. Since H is projective, $H = 0$, and hence $L = M$.

(2) “ $\Rightarrow$ ” is clear.

“ $\Leftarrow$ ” Let $M = N + L, L \leq M$. Since N is PSD in M, there is a projective summand H of M with $H \subseteq N \subseteq \delta(M)$ such that $M = H \oplus L$. So $\delta(H) \oplus \delta(L) = \delta(M) = H \oplus \delta(L)$. Thus $\delta(H) = H$. Since H is projective, H is semisimple by [10, Proposition 2.13]. Thus $N \ll_\delta M$ by [16, Lemma 1.2].

□

Corollary 2.4. *Let M be a module. Then*

1. *M is (δ-) supplemented if and only if for every submodule X of M, there is a submodule Y of M such that $X + Y = M$, $X \cap Y \subseteq (\delta(Y))$ $Rad(Y)$ and $X \cap Y$ is PSD in Y.*

(2) *M is (δ-) lifting if and only if for every submodule X of M, there is a decomposition $M = A \oplus B$ such that $A \subseteq X$ and $X \cap B \subseteq (\delta(B))$ $Rad(B)$ and $X \cap B$ is PSD in B.*

Definition 2.5. Let R be a ring and I an ideal of R, M a module. M is called an I-supplemented module (finitely I-supplemented module) if for every submodule (finitely generated submodule) X of M, there is a submodule Y of M such that $X + Y = M$, $X \cap Y \subseteq IY$ and $X \cap Y$ is PSD in Y. In this case, we call Y is an I-supplement of X in M. M is called I-lifting if for every submodule X of M, there is a decomposition $M = A \oplus B$ such that $A \subseteq X$ and $X \cap B \subseteq IB$ and $X \cap B$ is PSD in B.

Theorem 2.6. *Consider the following statements for a module M.*

(1) *M is a $J(R)$-supplemented module (a $\delta({}_RR)$-supplemented module, respectively).*

(2) *M is a supplemented module (a δ-supplemented module, respectively).*

then "(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2)", "(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1)" *if M is projective or R satisfies $J(R)M = Rad(M)$ ($\delta(R)M = \delta(M)$) for any module M over R.*

Proof. "(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2)" By Proposition 2.3.

"(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1)" Let M be a supplemented module. Then for every submodule X of M, there is a submodule Y of M such that $X+Y = M$ and $X\cap Y \ll Y$. Since M is projective, Y is a direct summand of M, and hence Y is projective. It is clear that $X \cap Y \subseteq Rad(Y) = J(R)Y$ and $X \cap Y$ is PSD in Y. (Let M be a δ-supplemented module. Since M is projective, M is δ-lifting. Thus for every submodule X of M, there is a direct summand Y of M such that $M = X + Y$ and $X \cap Y \ll_\delta Y$. The rest is obvious.) When R satisfies $J(R)M = Rad(M)$ ($\delta(R)M = \delta(M)$) for any module M over R, the proof is similar.

□

Similar to the proof of Theorem 2.6, we have the following.

Theorem 2.7. *Consider the following statements for a module M.*

1. *M is a finitely $J(R)$-supplemented module (a finitely $\delta({}_RR)$-supplemented module, respectively).*
2. *M is a finitely supplemented module (a finitely δ-supplemented module, respectively).*

then "(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2)", "(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1)" *if M is projective or R satisfies $J(R)M = Rad(M)$ $(\delta(R)M = \delta(M))$ for any module M over R.*

Theorem 2.8. *Consider the following statements for a module M.*

1. *M is a $J(R)$-lifting module (a $\delta({}_RR)$-lifting module, respectively).*
2. *M is a lifting module (a δ-lifting module, respectively).*

then "(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2)", "(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1)" *if M is projective or R satisfies $J(R)M = Rad(M)$ $(\delta(R)M = \delta(M))$ for any module M over R.*

We know that if a ring R is left ($\delta-$)semiperfect ring, then $(\delta(R)M = \delta(M))$ $J(R)M = Rad(M)$ for any module M over R. So "(1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2)" in Theorem 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8 if R is left ($\delta-$)semiperfect ring.

Lemma 2.9. *Let M be a module and $K, L, H \leq M$. If K is an I-supplement of L in M, L is an I-supplement of H in M, then L is an I-supplement of K in M.*

Proof. Let $M = K + L = L + H$, $K \cap L \subseteq IK, L \cap H \subseteq IL$ and $K \cap L$ be PSD in K, $L \cap H$ PSD in L. We only show that $K \cap L \subseteq IL$ and $K \cap L$ is PSD in L. It is easy to see that $K \cap L \subseteq IK \cap L$. Let $l = \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} p_i k_i \in IK \cap L$, $p_i \in I, k_i \in K$ and $k_i = l'_i + h_i (i = 1, 2, \cdots, n)$, $l'_i \in L, h_i \in H$. Since $L \cap H \subseteq IL$, $l \in IL$, and hence $K \cap L \subseteq IL$. Next, we shall prove that $K \cap L$ is PSD in L. Let $K \cap L + X = L, X \leq L$, then $M = L + H = K \cap L + X + H$. Since $K \cap L$ be PSD in K, $K \cap L$ be PSD in M by Lemma 2.2. Thus there is a projective summand Y of M with $Y \subseteq K \cap L$ such that $M = Y \oplus (X + H)$. Since $L = L \cap M = L \cap (Y \oplus (X + H)) = Y \oplus X + L \cap H$ and $L \cap H$ is PSD in L, there is a projective summand Y' of L with $Y' \subseteq L \cap H$ such that $L = Y \oplus X \oplus Y'$. Since $L/X \cong Y \oplus Y'$ is projective, the natural epimorphism

$f : K \cap L \to L/X$ splits, and hence $Kerf = K \cap X$ is a direct summand of $K \cap L$. Write $K \cap L = (K \cap X) \oplus Q, Q \leq K \cap L$. So $L = Q \oplus X$, as required.

□

Lemma 2.10. *Let M be a π-projective module. If N and K are I-supplement of each other in M, then $N \cap K$ is projective. If in addition M is projective, then N and K are projective.*

Proof. Let $f : N \oplus K \to N + K = M$ with $(n, k) \mapsto n + k$ for $n \in N, k \in K$. Since M is a π-projective module, f splits, and so $Kerf = \{(n, -n) | n \in N \cap K\}$ is a direct summand of $N \oplus K$. Write $N \oplus K = Kerf \oplus U, U \cong M$. Since $N \cap K$ is PSD in N and K, $Kerf$ is PSD in $N \oplus K$ by Lemma 2.2. Thus there is a projective summand Y of $N \oplus K$ with $Y \subseteq Kerf$ such that $N \oplus K = Y \oplus U$, so $Y = Kerf \cong N \cap K$ is projective. If M is projective, $Y \oplus U$ is projective. So N and K are projective. □

We end this section with the following lemma.

Lemma 2.11. *Let $M = A + B$. If M/A has a projective I-cover, then B contains an I-supplement of A.*

Proof. Let $\pi : B \to M/A$ be the canonical homomorphism and $f : P \to M/A$ a projective I-cover. Since P is projective, there is a homomorphism $g : P \to B$ such that $\pi g = f$. Thus $M = A + g(P)$ and $A \cap g(P) = g(Kerf)$. Since $Kerf \subseteq IP$ and $Kerf$ is PSD in P, $A \cap g(P) \subseteq Ig(P)$ and $A \cap g(P)$ is PSD in $g(P)$ by Lemma 2.2. So $g(P)$ is an I-supplement of A contained in B. □

3. **Characterizations of I-semiregular, I-semiperfect and I-perfect rings in terms of I-supplemented modules**

We shall chracterize I-semiregular rings, I-semiperfect rings and I-perfect rings by I-supplemented modules in this section. We begin this section with the following.

Theorem 3.1. *Let R be a ring and I an ideal of R, P a projective module. Consider the following conditions:*

1. *P is an I-supplemented module.*
2. *P is an I-semiperfect module.*

Then $(1) \Rightarrow (2)$*, and* $(2) \Rightarrow (1)$ *if P is PSD for I.*

Proof. "$(1) \Rightarrow (2)$" Let P be an I-supplemented module and $N \leq P$. Then there exists $X \leq P$ such that $P = N + X$, $N \cap X \subseteq IX$ and $N \cap X$ is PSD in X. Let $\pi : P \to P/N$ and $\pi \mid_X : X \to P/N$ be the canonical epimorphisms. Since P is projective, there is a homomorphism $g : P \to X$ such that $\pi \mid_X g = \pi$. We have $P = g(P) + N$ and $X = g(P) + N \cap X$. Since $N \cap X$ is PSD in X, there is a projective summand Y of X with $Y \subseteq N \cap X$ such that $X = g(P) \oplus Y$. It is easy to verify that $g(P) \cap N \subseteq Ig(P)$. Since $g(P) \cap N \subseteq N \cap X$ and $N \cap X$ is PSD in X, $g(P) \cap N$ is PSD in X by Lemma 2.2, and so $g(P) \cap N$ is PSD in $g(P)$ by Lemma 2.2. Thus $g(P)$ is an I-supplement of N in P. Since P is an I-supplemented module, $g(P)$ has an I-supplement Q in P. Thus $g(P)$ is also an I-supplement of Q in P by Lemma 2.9, and so $g(P)$ is projective by Lemma 2.10. Since $g(P) \cap N \subseteq Ig(P)$ and $g(P) \cap N$ is PSD in $g(P)$, the canonical epimorphism $g(P) \to P/N$ is a projective I-cover of P/N. So P is an I-semiperfect module by [12, Lemma 2.9].

"$(2) \Rightarrow (1)$" Let P be an I-semiperfect module, then for every submodule X of P, there is a decomposition $P = A \oplus Y$ such that A is projective, $A \subseteq X$ and $X \cap Y \subseteq IM$. Thus $P = X + Y$, $X \cap Y \subseteq IY$. Since P is PSD for I, $X \cap Y$ is PSD in Y by Lemma 2.2, as desired.

□

By Theorem 3.1, we know that if a module M is projective and PSD for I, then M is an I-supplemented module if and only if M is I-lifting if and only if M is an I-semiperfect module.

Corollary 3.2. *Let M be a projective module with $Rad(M) \ll M$ ($\delta(M) \ll_\delta M$). Then M is a (δ-)supplemented module if and only if M is a (δ-)semiperfect module if and only if M is a (δ-)lifting module.*

Theorem 3.3. *Let I be an ideal of R. Consider the following conditions:*

1. *Every finitely generated R-module is I-supplemented.*
2. *Every finitely generated projective R-module is I-supplemented.*
3. *Every finitely generated projective R-module is I-lifting.*
4. *${}_RR$ is an I-lifting.*
5. *${}_RR$ is an I-supplemented.*
6. *R is I-semiperfect.*

Then $(1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (5) \Rightarrow (6)$ *and* $(3) \Rightarrow (4) \Rightarrow (5)$*;* $(2) \Rightarrow (3)$ *and* $(6) \Rightarrow (1)$ *if R is a left PSD ring for I.*

Proof. "$(1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (5)$" and "$(3) \Rightarrow (4) \Rightarrow (5)$" are clear.

"$(5) \Rightarrow (6)$" By Theorem 3.1.

If R is a left PSD ring for I, then $(2) \Rightarrow (3)$ is obvious by Theorem 3.1 and [12, Corollary 2.4].

"$(6) \Rightarrow (1)$" Let M be a finitely generated module and $N \leq M$. Then $M = N + M$ and M/N has a projective I-cover by [12, Theorem 2.13], so M contains an I-supplement of N by Lemma 2.11. Hence M is I-supplemented. □

Let $I = J(R)$ or $\delta({}_RR)$ in Theorem 3.3, since R is a left PSD ring, we have the following.

Corollary 3.4. *([6, Theorem 4.41]) The following statements are equivalent for a ring R.*

1. *R is semiperfect.*
2. *Every finitely generated R-module is supplemented.*
3. *Every finitely generated projective R-module is supplemented.*
4. *Every finitely generated projective R-module is lifting.*

(5) $_RR$ *is lifting.*

(6) $_RR$ *is supplemented.*

Corollary 3.5. *([5, Theorem 3.3]) The following statements are equivalent for a ring R.*

(1) *R is δ-semiperfect.*

(2) *Every finitely generated R-module is δ-supplemented.*

(3) *Every finitely generated projective R-module is δ-supplemented.*

(4) *Every finitely generated projective R-module is δ-lifting.*

(5) $_RR$ *is δ-lifting.*

(6) $_RR$ *is δ-supplemented.*

Since if R is $Z(_RR)$-semiregular, then $Z(_RR) = J(R) \subseteq \delta(_RR)$, we have the following result.

Corollary 3.6. *The following statements are equivalent for a ring R.*

(1) *R is $Z(_RR)$-semiperfect.*

(2) *Every finitely generated R-module is $Z(_RR)$-supplemented.*

(3) *Every finitely generated projective R-module is $Z(_RR)$-supplemented.*

(4) *Every finitely generated projective R-module is $Z(_RR)$-lifting.*

(5) $_RR$ *is $Z(_RR)$-lifting.*

(6) $_RR$ *is $Z(_RR)$-supplemented.*

Since if $I \leq Soc(_RR)$, then R is a left PSD ring for I, and hence we have

Corollary 3.7. *The following statements are equivalent for a ring R.*

(1) *R is $Soc(_RR)$-semiperfect.*

(2) *Every finitely generated R-module is $Soc(_RR)$-supplemented.*

(3) *Every finitely generated projective R-module is $Soc(_RR)$-supplemented.*

(4) *Every finitely generated projective R-module is $Soc(_RR)$-lifting.*

(5) $_RR$ *is $Soc(_RR)$-lifting.*

(6) $_RR$ *is $Soc(_RR)$-supplemented.*

Theorem 3.8. *Let* R *be a left PSD ring and* I *an ideal of* R*. Then* R *is an* I*-semiregular ring if and only if* ${}_RR$ *is a finitely* I*-supplemented module if and only if* R_R *is a finitely* I*-supplemented module.*

Proof. Similar to Theorem 3.3. □

Corollary 3.9. *([11, Proposition 19.1]) The following statements are equivalent for a ring* R*.*

1. R *is semiregular.*
2. ${}_RR$ *is a finitely supplemented module.*
3. R_R *is a finitely supplemented module.*

Corollary 3.10. *The following statements are equivalent for a ring* R*.*

1. R *is* δ*-semiregular.*
2. ${}_RR$ *is a finitely* δ*-supplemented module.*
3. R_R *is a finitely* δ*-supplemented module.*

Corollary 3.11. *A ring* R *is* $Soc({}_RR)$*-semiregular if and only if* ${}_RR$ *is a finitely* $Soc({}_RR)$*-supplemented module if and only if* R_R *is a finitely* $Soc(R_R)$*-supplemented module.*

Corollary 3.12. *A ring* R *is* $Z({}_RR)$*-semiregular if and only if* ${}_RR$ *is a finitely* $Z({}_RR)$*-supplemented module if and only if* R_R *is a finitely* $Z(R_R)$*-supplemented module.*

Next we use I-supplemented modules to characterize I-perfect rings.

Definition 3.13. A ring R is called a strongly left PSD ring for I if any projective left R-module is PSD for I.

Theorem 3.14. *Let* I *be an ideal of* R*. Consider the following conditions:*

1. *Every* R*-module is* I*-supplemented.*
2. *Every projective* R*-module is* I*-supplemented.*

(3) *Every projective R-module is I-lifting.*

(4) *Every free R-module is I-lifting.*

(5) *Every free R-module is I-supplemented.*

(6) *R is a left I-perfect.*

Then $(1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (5) \Rightarrow (6)$, $(3) \Rightarrow (4) \Rightarrow (5)$*;* $(2) \Rightarrow (3)$ *and* $(6) \Rightarrow (1)$ *if R is a strongly left PSD ring for I.*

Proof. "$(1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (5)$" and "$(3) \Rightarrow (4) \Rightarrow (5)$" are clear.

"$(5) \Rightarrow (6)$" By Theorem 3.1.

When R is a strongly left PSD ring for I, "$(2) \Rightarrow (3)$" is obvious.

"$(6) \Rightarrow (1)$" Let M be a module. Then there is a free module F such that $\eta : F \to M$ is epic. Since F is I-semiperfect, there is a decomposition $F = F_1 \oplus F_2$ such that $F_1 \subseteq Ker\eta$ and $F_2 \cap Ker\eta \subseteq IF_2$. Since F is PSD for I, $F_2 \cap Ker\eta$ is PSD in F. By Lemma 2.2, $F_2 \cap Ker\eta$ is PSD in F_2, so $\eta|_{F_2} : F_2 \to M$ is a projective I-cover of M. The rest is similar to Theorem 3.3. □

Let $I = J(R)$ or $\delta({}_RR)$ in Theorem 3.14, since R is a strongly left PSD ring, we have the following.

Corollary 3.15. *([6, Theorem 4.41])The following statements are equivalent for a ring R.*

(1) *R is a left perfect.*

(2) *Every R-module is supplemented.*

(3) *Every projective R-module is supplemented.*

(4) *Every projective R-module is lifting.*

(5) *Every free R-module is lifting.*

(6) *Every free R-module is supplemented.*

Corollary 3.16. *([5, Theorem 3.4]) The following statements are equivalent for a ring R.*

(1) *R is a left δ-perfect.*

(2) *Every R-module is δ-supplemented.*

(3) *Every projective R-module is δ-supplemented.*

(4) *Every projective R-module is δ-lifting.*

(5) *Every free R-module is δ-lifting.*

(6) *Every free R-module is δ-supplemented.*

Since if $I \leq Soc({}_RR)$, then R is a strongly left PSD ring for I, and hence we have

Corollary 3.17. *The following statements are equivalent for a ring R.*

(1) *R is a left $Soc({}_RR)$-perfect.*

(2) *Every R-module is $Soc({}_RR)$-supplemented.*

(3) *Every projective R-module is $Soc({}_RR)$-supplemented.*

(4) *Every projective R-module is $Soc({}_RR)$-lifting.*

(5) *Every free R-module is $Soc({}_RR)$-lifting.*

(6) *Every free R-module is $Soc({}_RR)$-supplemented.*

Since if R is $Z({}_RR)$-perfect, then $Z({}_RR) = J(R) \subseteq \delta({}_RR)$, we have the following result.

Corollary 3.18. *The following statements are equivalent for a ring R.*

(1) *R is a left $Z({}_RR)$-perfect.*

(2) *Every R-module is $Z({}_RR)$-supplemented.*

(3) *Every projective R-module is $Z({}_RR)$-supplemented.*

(4) *Every projective R-module is $Z({}_RR)$-lifting.*

(5) *Every free R-module is $Z({}_RR)$-lifting.*

(6) *Every free R-module is $Z({}_RR)$-supplemented.*

References

[1] M. Alkan, W. K. Nicholson, A. C. Ozcan, A generalization of projective covers, J. Algebra 319 (2008) 4947-4960.

[2] M. Alkan, A. C. Ozcan, Semiregular modules with respect to a fully invariant submodule, Comm. Algebra 32(11) (2004) 4285-4301.

[3] F. W. Anderson and K. R. Fuller, Rings and Categories of Modules, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1974.

[4] J. Clark, C. Lomp, N. Vanaja and R. Wisbauer, Lifting modules, IN:Supplements and Projectivity in Module Theory Sereis: Frontiers in Mathematics, 2006.

[5] M. T. Kosan, δ-lifting and δ-supplemented modules, Algebra Colloq. 14 (2007) 53-60.

[6] S. H. Mohamed and B. J. Müller, Continuous and Discrete Modules, London Math. Soc.; LNS147, Cambridge Univ. Press: Cambridge, 1990.

[7] W. K. Nicholson, Semiregular modules and rings, Can. J. Math. 5 (1976) 1105-1120.

[8] W. K. Nicholson, Strong lifting, J. Algebra 285 (2005) 795-818.

[9] W. K. Nicholson, M. F. Yousif, Quasi-Frobenius Rings, Cambridge Tracts in Math., vol.158, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

[10] A. C. Ozcan, M. Alkan, Semiperfect modules with respect to a preradical, Comm. Algebra 34 (2006) 841-856.

[11] A. Tuganbaev, Rings Close to Regular, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2002.

[12] Y. D. Wang, Characterizations of I-semiregular and I-semiperfect rings, submitted.

[13] Y. D. Wang, Relatively semiregular modules, Algebra Colloq. 13 (2006) 647-654.

[14] R. Wisbauer, Foundations of Module and Ring Theory, Gordon and Breach, Philadelphia, 1991.

[15] M. F. Yousif, Y. Q. Zhou, Semiregular,semiperfect and perfect rings relative to an ideal, Rocky Mountain J. Math. 32 (2002) 1651-1671.

[16] Y. Q. Zhou, Generalizations of perfect, semiperfect, and semiregular rings, Algebra Colloq. 3 (2000) 305-318.